



# *Town of Brookline*

## *Massachusetts*

### PLANNING BOARD

Town Hall, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
333 Washington Street  
Brookline, MA 02445  
(617) 730-2130 Fax (617) 730-2442  
TTY (617) 730-2327

Mark J. Zarrillo, Chairman  
Linda K. Hamlin, Clerk  
Robert Cook  
Steven A. Heikin  
Steven R. Kanés  
Sergio Modigliani  
Jonathan Simpson

### **BROOKLINE PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES** **Room 111, First Floor, Brookline Town Hall** **April 17, 2014 – 7:30p.m.**

**Board Present:** Mark Zarrillo, Linda Hamlin, Robert Cook, Steven Kanés,  
Sergio Modigliani and Jonathan Simpson

**Staff Present:** Polly Selkoe and Timothy Richard

Mark Zarrillo called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm.

### **BOARD OF APPEALS CASES**

**239 Walnut Street** – subdivide lot and construct two attached single family dwellings on new lot and a common driveway to be shared by the existing house and new attached single families, requiring a special permit for the common driveway (5/1) Pct. 5

Timothy Richard described the case and the zoning relief required. [It was explained that because of the configuration of the units, it is a two family, not two attached single families.]

Robert Allen, attorney, was present to discuss the case with the Board. Mr. Allen discussed the special permit that would be required for permission of the common driveway, and the discussions that they have had with the neighbors and Preservation Commission.

Mike McKay, architect, was present to discuss the site plan and elevations with the Planning Board.

Katherine Adams, 4 Upland Road, was present and was thankful that the applicant made an effort to preserve one of the trees on the site.

Rochelle Selzer, 266 Walnut Street, was present and supportive of the common driveway because she wanted to see the tree preserved.

Sergio Modigliani asked for clarification that the open space requirement was satisfied. Staff confirmed that it was.

Mark Zarrillo ***motioned to recommend approval.***  
Sergio Modigliani ***seconded*** the motion.

**Voted (6-0): The Planning Board recommended approval of the plans prepared by McKay Architects, dated January 2014, and site plan by VTP Associates, dated 2/19/14, subject to the following conditions:**

1. Prior to issuance of a building permit, final elevations shall be submitted to the Preservation Commission and the Assistant Director of Regulatory Planning for review and approval.
2. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall record an easement to establish a common driveway under mutual easements and shall submit it to the Building Commissioner for review and approval.
3. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit to the Building Commissioner to ensure conformance to the Board of Appeals decision: 1) a final site plan, stamped and signed by a registered land surveyor or engineer; 2) final building elevations, stamped and signed by a registered architect; and 3) evidence the Board of Appeals decision has been recorded at the Registry of Deeds.

**79 Coolidge Street** (continued) – construct a single-car garage in rear yard, requiring side and rear yard setback relief and design of all off-street parking (5/1) Pct. 8

Polly Selkoe described the case and the zoning relief required, and the reason the case was continued.

Robert Allen, attorney, was present to discuss the case with the Board, along with the architect.

Lee and Marilyn Roosevelt, 74 Coolidge Street, were present and appreciative that the applicant reduced the height of the garage. They still believed that the height was still too high despite the reduction. Mark Zarrillo asked if they would prefer a flat roof. They said that they would because of the slope of the roof, not much more light would be blocked by the higher roof ridge.

Christopher Mauer, neighborhood resident, would prefer a garage that is lower in height.

Robert Cook asked the neighbors if they would support the proposal if the height were lowered. The neighbors said that they would like to see the overall length of the structure reduced.

Linda Hamlin thought that a garage with a pitched roof would look better, not collect debris, and would not block much more light since the roof would slope away from the abutter. She thought that perhaps the neighbors would be more pleased with the proposed garage if they liked the design.

Robert Cook said that he would like to see plans showing the relationship of the neighboring house to the garage.

Mark Zarrillo asked the neighbors if they would be agreeable if the applicant were to have a garage with a flat roof. Mr. Zarrillo said that since the neighbors were agreeable with the garage, they might as well make it look good with a pitched roof.

Steve Kanes agreed with Linda Hamlin that the current proposal with a sloped roof would be more attractive .

Jonathan Simpson thought that they should approve the project that the neighbors wanted.

Robert Cook preferred a sloped roof but would like it better if the pitch could be reduced. Robert Allen said that they would try to give an example to the Board of Appeals showing how the garage would look compared to the neighboring property.

Linda Hamlin suggested that the applicant remove the front dormer from the proposal. Mr. Allen agreed that they could do that.

Sergio Modigliani was not going to vote in favor of the proposal because the architect was not present and didn't feel comfortable changing the design.

Mark Zarrillo ***motioned to recommend approval*** if there is a pitched roof as low as reasonable without a dormer.

Steve Kanes ***seconded*** the motion.

**Voted (5-1): The Planning Board recommended approval of the plans prepared by Dartagnan Brown, dated 8/6/2013, and the site plan by George C. Collins, dated 3/26/2014, subject to the following conditions:**

1. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit final plans and elevations subject to the review and approval of the Assistant Director of Regulatory Planning. Plans will show a flat roof as reasonable as possible and the dormer shall be removed.
2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a final landscape plan indicating all counterbalancing amenities subject to the review and approval of the Assistant Director of Regulatory Planning.
3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit to the Building Commissioner for review and approval for conformance to the Board of Appeals decision: 1) a final site plan stamped and signed by a registered engineer or land surveyor; 2) final garage elevations stamped and signed by a registered architect; and 3) evidence that the Board of Appeals decision has been recorded at the Registry of Deeds.

**7 Harvard Avenue** – convert from a two-family to a single-family dwelling and business use, and construct additions at the side and rear, requiring parking and setback relief (4/24) Pct. 7

Timothy Richard described the case and the zoning relief required.

Chih Ming Lee, architect, was present to discuss the case with the Board.

Jonathan Simpson asked if they have given any thought to signage on the lot. The architect said a little.

Mark Zarrillo asked what the counterbalancing amenity was going to be. Robert Allen said that there would be a landscaping plan.

Sergio Modigliani had a technical question. He said that there is a very large flat roof in the center, and then asked if that was accurate. He asked if it was flat in the center because of the height limit. The applicant said that it is indeed flat because of the height limit. Linda Hamlin thought that they should have a completely flat roof.

Linda Hamlin asked if there was any way to do an overhang in the rear.

Ali Shangi, who lives in Weston and owns 3 Harvard Avenue, thought that this proposal was going to add to the problem of parking in the area.

Christopher Shannon, attorney, represented 3-5 Harvard Avenue for the Little Corner Schoolhouse. The owner had concerns about the lack of parking that already exists in the neighborhood.

Linda Hamlin was not ready to accept the design of the façade with all of the additions. She would like to see conditions on what the proposal looks like.

Steve Kanes agreed with Linda Hamlin that the aesthetics of the building should be improved.

Robert Allen suggested that they come back with a better design plan and agreed to continue the case to a future date.

The case was continued.

**29 Harvard Street** – convert an existing office space into a dental office, requiring parking relief (4/24) Pct. 4

Timothy Richard described the case and the zoning relief required.

Mike Brandewyn, attorney, was present to discuss the case with the Board. He said that they are seeking a waiver of two parking spaces.

Linda Hamlin asked if they had a site plan for the proposal. [Response: no.]

The Board did not have a problem with the proposal.

Mark Zarrillo ***motioned to recommend approval.***

Robert Cook ***seconded*** the motion.

**Voted (6-0): The Planning Board recommended approval of the plans and elevations prepared by King Design Associates, Inc., dated 12/4/13, subject to the following conditions:**

1. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit final floor plans and a site plan, subject to the review and approval of the Assistant Director of Regulatory Planning.
2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit to the Building Commissioner for review and approval for conformance to the Board of Appeals decision: 1) final floor plans stamped and signed by a registered architect; 2) evidence that the Board of Appeals decision has been recorded at the Registry of Deeds.

**1212-1220 Boylston Street** – convert an existing retail use to a bank with a drive thru window and install parking, requiring design review, setback, and parking relief (4/24) Pct. 15

Timothy Richard described the case and the zoning relief required.

Robert Allen, attorney, was present to discuss the case with the Board.

The Traffic Engineer from Tighe & Bond was present to discuss why they designed the parking in the manner that they did.

Mark Zarrillo thought that they had the traffic worked out but did not like the site plan. He wanted to see some more planting and some more pedestrian access from the parking lot to the bank. He thought that they should work with a Landscape Architect to help design the site.

The Board agreed that they should come back before them for final approval of Design Review and the landscaping plan.

Mark Zarrillo *motioned to recommend approval*.

Robert Cook *seconded* the motion.

**Voted (6-0): The Planning Board recommends approval of the drive-thru use and the site plan by Tighe & Bond Consulting Engineers, dated 2/13/14. Should the Board of Appeals find that the applicant meets the statutory requirements for a special permit, the Planning Board recommends the following conditions:**

1. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall return to the Planning Board for full Design Review of elevations and approval of a final landscaping plan.
2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a final lighting plan for the parking lot to the Building Commissioner for review and approval.
3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a final site plan and elevations, consistent with what was discussed by the Planning Board, shall be submitted to the Planning Board

for final approval.

4. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall obtain approval from the Director of Engineering and Transportation for all curb cuts and changes to on-street parking and site circulation.
5. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit to the Building Commissioner for review and approval for conformance to the Board of Appeals decision: 1) a final site plan stamped and signed by a registered engineer or land surveyor; 2) final building elevations stamped and signed by a registered architect; and 3) evidence that the Board of Appeals decision has been recorded at the Registry of Deeds.

**107-109 Colbourne Crescent** – construct a second story rear deck, requiring rear yard setback relief (5/1) Pct. 12

Polly Selkoe described the case and the zoning relief required.

The applicants, Diane Krause and Craig Hagan, were present to discuss the case with the Board.

Mark Zarrillo complimented the architect on the fine plans and elevations.

Mark Zarrillo ***motioned to recommend approval.***  
Jonathan Simpson ***seconded*** the motion.

**Voted (5-0)[ *Linda Hamlin was not present for this case*]: The Planning Board recommended approval of the plans prepared by Hamlin & Co. Inc., dated 1/29/14, and the site plan by Scott M. Cerrato, P.L.S., dated 1/29/14, subject to the following conditions:**

1. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, final plans and elevations, and a final site plan indicating all proposed setback dimensions, shall be submitted subject to the review and approval of the Assistant Director of Regulatory Planning.
2. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a final landscaping plan indicating all counterbalancing amenities to the Assistant Director of Regulatory Planning for review and approval.
3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit to the Building Commissioner for review and approval for conformance to the Board of Appeals decision: 1) a final site plan stamped and signed by a registered engineer or land surveyor; 2) final building elevations stamped and signed by a registered architect; and 3) evidence that the Board of Appeals decision has been recorded at the Registry of Deeds.

### **Minutes**

Mark Zarrillo ***motioned to recommend approval*** of the minutes from March 6, 2014.

Sergio Modigliani ***seconded*** the motion.

Voted (5-0) to approve the 3/6/14 minutes with revisions.

**Meeting adjourned.**

**Materials Reviewed During Meeting**

- Staff Reports
- Site Plans and Elevations
- Minutes of the March 6, 2014, Planning Board Meeting
- Capital Improvements Program Letter